

# a map issue I noticed

Laverne <bucklady@charter.net>

Mon 10/31/2016 3:03 PM

To: Brian Pedrotti <bpedrotti@co.slo.ca.us>; Vicki Shelby <vshelby@co.slo.ca.us>;

This is a copy of what I sent to Frank.

Brian, As I find time to review with the hard copy, do you want any more discrepancies I see or just let it go? You are probably as frustrated as I am. Basically I think it is a good plan, it just needs to be cleaned up. How can I best help?

Laverne

Wherever you are today, may the sun shine on you. Whatever you do today, may it give you a sense of peace and completion.....Live simple. Love generously. Care deeply. Speak kindly. Leave the rest to God!

bucklady@charter.net

>

>

> After the meeting I wanted to go back to that planning land use map and get a closer look because it was difficult at the meeting to really study it. Here is an example of things I keep finding in the plan. I looked at the what is present planning land use map and then wanted to check with this proposed map -- Figure 3-B on page 3-7 in hearing draft. Here's my reaction to that. I just don't remember us going along with so much RMF. We were trying to eliminate some.

>

> From my perspective, it has too many greens that are hard to decipher, some yellow where it shouldn't be and it looks like the URL was changed from what it is now but probably isn't because the river is not identifiable which is another problem. They need to figure out how to label the river other than ag or open space because the river is not ag land but it may be used as open space. I also still have concerns about the amount of RMF showing. I seem to remember that on L St. between 10th and 11th St. on the West side (hill slope) RMF was removed to RSF. Seems like there is a note to that effect as well, just don't remember just where. But this map includes RMF all the way to 12th.(as is the present zoning) p. 3-11 map doesn't include 11th-12th St, but does include 10th to 11th. that page also has a slightly different inclusionary RMF designation at top of diagram that is presently mostly single family home area. I had talked to Brian about RMF on E side of N St. which I still believe is wrong and then E. 12th St. doesn't match the Rec.designation indicated elsewhere. I don't believe we wanted that entire area RMF.

>

> You can tell I'm frustrated as I'm sure Brian and Rob are, coming into this late in the game. I really can't see the county redoing a bunch of these pages and really wondering how, if this will be resolved as well as how much I should push it. Sounds like we only have a couple hours planned on that Nov 10 agenda and makes me doubtful it will come to a conclusion in that amount of time.

> Any suggestions moving forward here?

> Laverne

> Wherever you are today, may the sun shine on you. Whatever you do today, may it give you a sense of peace and completion.....Live simple. Love generously. Care deeply. Speak kindly. Leave the rest to God!

>

> bucklady@charter.net

>

>

>